

REMARKS

Claim 2 has been amended, claims 1 and 3-22 remain unchanged, and claims 23-28 have been added. Thus, claims 1-28 are pending.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11, 12, 16, 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mazzamuto (USP 5,665,953).

Claims 4, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazzamuto in view of Levitsky (USP 6,466,948).

Claims 5, 6, 13-15 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazzamuto in view of Shustorovich (USP 5,912,986).

Abstract

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract as not being in narrative form. However, the Abstract appears to be in narrative form and proper format. Applicant thus respectfully request that the Examiner more specifically explain the objection to the Abstract, so that Applicant may fully address the Examiner's concerns.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a computer system that, among other features, is operable to receive raw data for an unidentified product, compare the raw data against data for a plurality of known products, and if there is a match, assign the respective standardized product code of the matching known product to the unidentified product. For example, for an unidentified product such as a bottle of ketchup, the computer system of claim 1 may receive raw data (such as "TOMATO KETCHUP BOTTLE FANCY GRADE"), and based on the raw data, assign a standardized product code (such as a UPC code or a proprietary code) to the bottle of ketchup.

Mazzamuto does not teach or suggest the assignment of a standardized product code to an unidentified product. Specifically, Mazzamuto describes a hand held device designed to help a shopper keep track of his/her coupons while shopping. The hand held device contains a scanner that scans the UPC codes printed on the shopper's coupons. The hand held device also includes a display that shows the shopper which coupons have been scanned in. Such a device clearly assumes that each coupon is associated with a known product, and that the UPC code printed on the couple is already assigned to that known product. Indeed, this is consistent with the widely known use of coupons by which the UPC code printed on each coupon is already assigned to a known product. Thus, Mazzamuto teaches a particular use of standardized product

codes already assigned to known products, not the assignment of standardized product codes to unidentified products. For at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable over Mazzamuto.

Applicants recognize that standardized product codes, once assigned to known products, may have numerous uses. One such use may be the scanning of a standardized product code on a coupon that leads to recognition of a known product, as described in Mazzamuto. The challenge, however, lies in taking an unidentified product for which only raw data may be available and assigning a standardized product code to the unidentified product, based on the raw data. Mazzamuto completely fails to even recognize this problem. In fact, by assuming a world that contains only known products, with standardized product codes already assigned to the known products, Mazzamuto appears to suggest that there is no need at all to deal with any unidentified product that has not yet been assigned a standardized product code. As such, Mazzamuto not only fails to disclose, but in fact teaches away from, a computer system operable to assign a standardized product code to an unidentified product, as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is thus allowable over Mazzamuto for this reason, as well.

Claims 2-22

Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out the typographical error in claim 2. Claim 2 has been amended to correct this error. Claims 2-7 each depends from claim 1 and therefore incorporates all the limitations of claim 1. As such, claims 2-7 are allowable, for at least the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

Claim 8 recites a method for generating standardized product data. For at least the reasons listed above with regard to claim 1, claim 8 is also allowable.

Claims 9-15 each depends from claim 8 and therefore incorporates all the limitations of claim 8. As such, claims 9-15 are also allowable, for at least the reasons stated above with regard to claim 8.

Claim 16 recites a computer system for generating standardized product data. For at least the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1, claim 16 is also allowable.

Claims 17-21 each depends from claim 16 and therefore incorporates all the limitations of claim 16. As such, claims 17-21 are also allowable, for at least the reasons stated above with regard to claim 16.

Claim 22 recites a method for generating standardized product data. For at least the reasons listed above with regard to claim 1, claim 22 is also allowable.

New claims 23-28

Newly added claims 23 and 24 each depends from claim 1 and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 1. As such, claims 23 and 24 are allowable, for at least the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

Newly added claims 25 and 26 each depends from claim 8 and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 8. As such, claims 25 and 26 are allowable, for at least the reasons stated above with regard to claim 8.

Newly added claims 27 and 28 recite a computer system and a method, respectively, for generating standardized product data. Claims 27 and 28 are also allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1.

Claims 23-28 are also fully supported by the specification. For example, support for claims 23 and 25 include Fig. 14, step 310 and p. 54, line 9 through p. 55, line 10. Support for claims 24 and 26 include Fig. 10, step 184 and p. 44, lines 1-10. Support for claims 27 and 28 include claims 1 and 8 and corresponding descriptions in the specification.

All the pending claims of the subject application comply with all requirements of 35 U.S.C. Accordingly, Applicant requests examination and allowance of all pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Ko-Fang Chang
Reg. No. 50,829

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400 / Fax: 415-576-0300
KC/ka
PA 3299580 v1